

1 BRIAN J. STRETCH (CABN 163973)  
2 United States Attorney

3 BARBARA J. VALLIERE (DCBN 439353)  
4 Chief, Criminal Division

5 DAMALI A. TAYLOR (CABN 262489)  
6 WILLIAM FRENTZEN (LABN 24421)  
7 Assistant United States Attorney

8 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055  
9 San Francisco, California 94102-3495  
10 Telephone: (415) 436-6401  
11 FAX: (415) 436-6753  
12 damali.taylor@usdoj.gov; william.frentzen@usdoj.gov

13 Attorneys for United States of America

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

16 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

17 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) CR 16-71663  
18 Plaintiff, ) MEMORANDUM BY THE UNITED STATES IN  
19 v. ) FURTHER SUPPORT OF THE DETENTION OF  
20 MARCUS ETIENNE  
21 Defendant. ) Hearing date: February 1, 2017  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

---

19 **INTRODUCTION**

20 This is no ordinary marijuana conspiracy case. As the Complaint describes, it is a multi-district  
21 marijuana conspiracy that resulted in the murders of two of the defendant's co-conspirators. The  
22 evidence—some of which was shared with the Court during the defendant's detention hearing—  
23 implicates the defendant in these homicides. Not only is the defendant facing a five-year mandatory  
24 minimum sentence in this case, he is also aware that he is under investigation for those homicides. In  
25 short, he has strong incentive to flee and the financial means to accomplish it. As if that were not  
26 sufficient, the defendant has a long history of violating court orders. Given the facts and circumstances  
27 of this case—as further described below—it is no surprise that Pretrial Services Offices in two different  
28 districts have recommended that the defendant be detained.

1 There is ample reason for the Court to find that, by clear and convincing evidence, no condition  
2 or combination of conditions in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(c) will reasonably assure the safety of any other  
3 person and the community. *See* 18 U.S.C. §§ 3142(e) and (f); *United States v. Motamedi*, 767 F.2d  
4 1403, 1406 (9th Cir. 1985). The Court should also find by a preponderance of the evidence that no  
5 condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the defendant's presence in court. *Id.*

6

## 7 ARGUMENT

8 **The Defendant Poses an Incredible Risk of Flight.**

9 The defendant has a criminal history that is replete with failures to appear. In reviewing his  
10 criminal history, undersigned counsel counted *nine* separate failures to appear/bench warrants/fugitive  
11 warrants. As if that were not bad enough, he also has a conviction for committing a battery on a police  
12 officer. *See* Exhibit A. His conviction history also includes multiple violations of probation, as well as  
13 felony convictions for possession with intent to distribute cocaine. Some of these convictions overlap.  
14 Moreover, the defendant has ready access to huge amounts of capital and he has strong incentive to flee.  
15 A review of a drug ledger, located at the found during a May 2016 search executed at the defendant's  
16 home—and confirmed by his co-defendant as a drug ledger of money owed to the defendant—shows  
17 that multiple individuals owe and/or have already paid the defendant tens of thousands of dollars in  
18 connection with this marijuana conspiracy, furthering the defendant's access to funds which could aid in  
19 his flight. A review of defendant's flight records also shows consistent travel throughout the United  
20 States. The defendant has not and cannot explain how a halfway house environment—an environment  
21 everyone agrees he can simply walk away from—could mitigate this risk.

22

23 **The Defendant is a Danger to the Community.**

24 In addition to the defendant's history of flouting court orders, this Court should be concerned by  
25 the fact that the defendant is under investigation for two different homicides—murders of his co-  
26 conspirators in the very conspiracy charged in this case. With respect to the March 2016 murder of his  
27 co-conspirator Thibodeaux in Oakland, CA, flight records indicate that the defendant flew to the bay  
28 area with Thibodeaux and flew back right before the murder. This is consistent with the statement that

1 soon-to-be murder victim Rodney Savoy gave to law enforcement after Thibodeaux's murder. Savoy  
 2 made clear to law enforcement that he believed this defendant was responsible for Thibodeaux's  
 3 murder—not as the shooter, but the one who directed it.<sup>1</sup> Savoy described uncharged co-defendant  
 4 Mario Robinson as one of the defendant's enforcers. Savoy himself was murdered 5 months later in the  
 5 area of defendant's hometown near Opelousas, Louisiana. When law enforcement questioned the  
 6 defendant about Savoy's homicide at the time of his arrest, the defendant admitted that Savoy owed the  
 7 defendant money when he was killed. The murder weapon has not been found concerning either  
 8 homicide.

9       In the weeks before he was arrested in this case and had evidence destroyed (as discussed  
 10 below), the defendant was arrested for threatening to kill his sister-in-law. He told her "that he was  
 11 going to kill her, and put a bullet through her head." *See* Exhibit B. She was clear that she did not feel  
 12 safe and was afraid of what the defendant would do to her. *Id.* This is the same sister-in-law whose  
 13 home the defendant ordered another co-conspirator (Craig Marshall) to burglarize just last month.

14

15 **The Defendant Has Already Obstructed Justice.**

16       On December 14, 2016—the day after he was arrested in the instant case, the defendant placed  
 17 multiple phone calls trying to reach Craig Marshall to get him to conceal evidence. Marshall is an  
 18 uncharged co-conspirator in the charged marijuana conspiracy. The defendant's phone calls to  
 19 Marshall—made from a Louisiana jail—were recorded. In these calls, the defendant and Marshall (as  
 20 well as another unknown male) discussed the search that law enforcement conducted at the time of the  
 21 defendant's arrest, which occurred in Carencro, LA. Marshall told the defendant that he and the  
 22 defendant's other cronies had been driving back and forth watching as law enforcement executed the  
 23 warrant in Carencro, LA, which is the residence that Etienne was observed leaving prior to his arrest.  
 24 The two discussed the fact law enforcement didn't find anything during the search. Law enforcement  
 25 did not locate evidence concerning the aforementioned murders during the search warrant at the

26

27       <sup>1</sup> The investigation into those murders is ongoing. As a result, undersigned counsel simply cannot  
 28 disclose all of the information we have concerning these murders without jeopardizing the investigation,  
 potential evidence and potential witnesses. Nor should the government have to, given the record before  
 the Court and this defendant's history. There is more than enough to support his detention.

1 Carencro, LA residence.

2       Very quickly into their conversation, the defendant instructed Marshall to break into his mother-  
3 in-law's home to retrieve a Nike shoe box from the residence. In a later call, the defendant confirmed  
4 that Marshall and/or other individual(s) went to get "the stuff." Not surprisingly, the defendant's  
5 mother-in-law and sister-in-law later spoke with the Sheriff's Office and reported that there was a break-  
6 in at the residence. When police arrived, they observed that someone had used a tool to pry open a  
7 window; the window screen was on the floor. The defendant's mother-in-law provided police with  
8 consent to search the residence. The defendant's sister-in-law told police that she had observed a  
9 vehicle "continuously passing in front of the residence...at a very slow pace and routinely stop." *See*  
10 Exhibit B, filed under seal herewith. She "assumed that the occupants of the vehicle are the individuals  
11 responsible for breaking into the residence." *Id.* She also noted that the home had never been  
12 burglarized before. In sum, the home was burglarized on the very evening that the defendant directed a  
13 co-conspirator(s) to go there to retrieve a shoebox. Nothing was reported stolen from the residence,  
14 however, if a shoebox that Etienne described had been there, it was gone when law enforcement  
15 searched the house after the burglary.

16

17 **A Halfway House Does Nothing to Mitigate these Risks.**

18       The government is troubled by the Court's inclination to place the defendant in a halfway house.  
19 There is nothing whatsoever preventing a defendant from simply walking out of a halfway house. There  
20 are no locks on the doors, and no armed guards. In *Fulgham*, Judge Westmore recognized the well-  
21 known, irrefutable fact in denying a similar motion. 2012 WL 2792439, at \*5 ("Defendant suggested  
22 that he live in a halfway house, but that is not a viable option because he could walk away from a  
23 halfway house at any time."). During the detention hearing, the Court remarked that it is possible for the  
24 defendant to order a homicide from jail. However, as the Court is aware, jail calls are recorded and  
25 monitored. Ordering a homicide on a jail call would make Etienne both incredibly stupid and incredibly  
26 brazen. By contrast, calls made from a halfway house are free from scrutiny. Placing defendant  
27 Etienne, a.k.a., "Hitler" in an unfettered halfway house environment would be a boon for him. The  
28 government's fears are neither speculative nor unwarranted. This man is being investigated for two

homicides. The government does not believe that he is finished.

2 All of the following remains unchanged: 1) Pretrial Services in two districts recommended that  
3 the defendant be detained; 2) The defendant has numerous bench warrants for failure to appear; 3) the  
4 defendant was convicted for battery on a police officer; 4) the defendant knows that he is being  
5 investigated for murdering his co-conspirators (crimes for which he would face life); 5) the defendant is  
6 currently facing a mandatory minimum imprisonment of five years; 6) the defendant has already  
7 directed a co-conspirator(s) to destroy evidence from county jail, thereby obstructing justice; and 7) the  
8 defendant is free to simply walk away from a halfway house. It is inconceivable how releasing  
9 defendant Etienne to a halfway house could mitigate the risks he poses and no one has even tried to  
10 establish how a halfway house could possibly hold him.

## CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, the government respectfully requests that defendant Etienne be detained for the safety of the community and because he is a demonstrated risk of flight.

Dated: January 29, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

BRIAN J. STRETCH  
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

By: \_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Damali Taylor  
Assistant United States Attorney